

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

MICHAEL HODGE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Civ. No. 99-561 DJS/WWD ACE

SGT. MARK RHOADS, et al.,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court upon Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Answers to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories and First Request for Production of Documents (Docket #30) filed December 1, 1999. Initially, Plaintiffs sought full and complete responses to requests for production numbered 4, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, and 19 and interrogatories numbered 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, and 16; however, in their Reply, certain accommodations are referred to and it appears that we are now addressing only request for production 4, and interrogatories 5, 6, 14, and 15. The materials sought in requests for production 9, 10, 11, 14, and 15 are to be submitted to the Court on or before January 4, 2000, for an *in camera* inspection. These materials shall be Bates stamped with consecutive numbers so as to facilitate reference and handling by the Court. Defendants shall supply the Court with an itemized and descriptive list of any materials which are withheld from the Court and which have been sought in Requests 9, 10, 11, 14, and 15. This list shall also contain any purported reason for withholding the materials from the *in camera* inspection. On or before January 4, 2000, Defendants shall produce to Plaintiffs copies of the filed interview cards sought in request No. 4. On or before January 7, 2000, Defendants shall

serve full and complete responses to interrogatory no. 14. I find that the response to interrogatory no. 5 is sufficient, and that the objections to interrogatories no. 6 and no.15 are well taken.

Discovery shall proceed in accordance with the foregoing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE